

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claim 8 was objected to due to certain informalities. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Halila et al. [US Pat. 5,291,732]. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartel et al. [US Pat. 4,307,993]. Claims 2-7 and 12-18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By the present Response, claims 8, 9 and 14 are amended. The specification has been amended to overcome the informalities mentioned in the Office Action. No new matter has been added.

Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-20 will remain pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to because of certain informalities on page 7, lines 16-17, and on page 8, lines 10-11. The paragraph beginning at page 5, line 5, and the paragraphs beginning at page 6, line 25, and ending at page 8, line 15 have been replaced to obviate the objections raised in the Office Action. No new matter has been added. The replacement paragraphs are believed to obviate all of the objections raised by the Examiner. Review and acceptance of the replacement paragraphs are requested.

Claim objections due to informalities

In the Office Action, claim 8 was objected to due to certain informalities. Claim 8 has been amended to obviate the objection raised in the Office Action. Thus reconsideration and allowance of amended claim 8 are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 8 and 9.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Halila et al. [US Pat. 5,291,732]. A *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires a showing that each limitation of a claim is found in a single reference, practice or device. Applicants respectfully submit that the Halila reference does not teach, disclose or suggest all the claim recitations of independent claims 8 and 9. In particular it does not disclose, or suggest a “plurality of cavities formed into a surface” of a component, as recited in claims 8 and 9.

Halila discloses an interface structure for a liner 36 and a frame 44, wherein the outer liner 36 includes a plurality of circumferentially spaced apart and radially outwardly extending liner tenons 72 that mesh with adjoining and alternating tenons 68 provided on the frame 44 (column 8, lines 33-56). While it is mentioned in the reference that the liner tenons 72 define radially extending slots 74, the reference does not disclose, or suggest a plurality of cavities formed into a surface of one of the interfacing components, as recited in claims 8 and 9. Support for this recitation can be found in the paragraph beginning at page 8, line 27 of Applicants’ application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation for the independent claims 8 and 9. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Halila et al. [US Pat. 5,291,732] be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 9 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartel et al. [US Pat. 4,307,993]. Applicant respectfully submits that the Hartel reference does not teach, disclose or suggest all the recitations set forth in independent claims 8 and 9.

In particular, the Hartel reference discloses a ring holder 4 comprising one or more slots 5 defined therein, which accept multiple split rings 6, which are further slidable along slots 5. However, the reference does not teach, disclose or suggest a plurality of protuberances formed on a surface of a first component or a plurality of cavities formed into a surface of a second component, different from the first component, as recited in claims 8 and 9.

In view of the above distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claims 8 and 9 of the present application are not anticipated by the Hartel reference. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hartel et al. [US Pat. 4,307,993] be withdrawn

Claims 1, 11 and 19.

Claims 1, 11, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartel et al. [US Pat. 4,307,993]. Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention, as claimed in independent claims 1, 11 and 19, is patentable over the Hartel reference. The Hartel reference does not disclose each element of the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 11 and 19.

In particular, the Hartel reference does not teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed “first attachment structure”. While the Hartel reference discloses a ring holder 4 (interpreted as a “support member” in the Office Action), which accepts split rings 6 (interpreted as a “second attachment structure” in the Office Action) in cavities or slots 5 defined in the ring holder 4, it does not mention a first attachment structure, which is accepted in a cavity defined by the support member, and slidably engaged with the second attachment structure. In contrast, the split rings 6 in the Hartel reference are radially slidable along the slots 5 defined in the ring holder 4 (*see* Hartel, column 2, lines 11-18), and not slidably engaged with a separate attachment structure.

In view of the above distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that, the present invention, as claimed in independent claims 1, 11 and 19 is not anticipated by the Hartel reference. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 11 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hartel et al. [US Pat. 4,307,993] be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-7 and 12-18.


Claims 2-7 and 12-18 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 11 respectively. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2-8 and 12-18 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim, as well as for this subject matter they separately recite. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/10/2004



Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545